

REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 21, 2001 with claims 1-24. Claims 1-24 have been canceled, and claims 25-46 have been added. Claims 25, 36, and 41-46 are the pending independent claims.

In the non-final Office Action dated September 22, 2004, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and (ii) rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,905,973 to Yonezawa et al. (hereinafter “Yonezawa”).

In an Office Action dated April 6, 2005, the Examiner contends that the newly added claims are not readable on the elected invention because “the canceled claims 1-24 are drawn to Graphical User Interface, Class 715, while the newly added claims 25-44 are drawn to Multi-computer data transferring, Class 709.” Applicants assert that the newly added claims are readable on the elected invention and not distinct from the canceled claims.

The canceled independent claims recite information recording service provision methods and systems. The newly added independent claims recite techniques for providing a printing service for electronic data over a computer network. An information recording service is substantially similar to a printing service for electronic data. Further, canceled independent claim 1 recites a method that uses a computer network having a service provider computer, a data provider computer and a client computer.

Additionally, substantially similar limitations to those recited in independent claims 25, 36 and 41-46 can be found in the canceled independent claims. For example, with regard to independent claim 25, the limitation of “receiving a print request from a client computer at a printing provider computer,” is substantially similar to “transmitting said input client information to said service provider computer,” as recited in canceled claim 1. Additionally, the limitation of “obtaining a data file associated with the print request from a data provider computer at the printing provider computer,” is substantially similar to “obtaining said target data at said service provider computer,” as recited in canceled claim 1. Finally, the limitation of “requesting, at the printing provider computer, the printing of the data file and the dispatching of the printed data file to a client,” is

substantially similar to “recording said target data; and transmitting the recorded material to said client computer in accordance with said client information,” as recited in canceled claim 1. These similarities between the canceled independent claims and newly added independent claims prove that the newly added claims are readable on the elected invention.

As shown and described above, the canceled claims were not drawn to a Graphical User Interface as stated by the Examiner. Further, while the Examiner contends that the canceled claims were drawn to class 715, the references supplied by the Examiner in the Office Action of September 22, 2004 are from classes 705 and 709. Thus, it appears classes 705 and 709 were searched in response to the canceled claims. The Examiner now contends that the newly added claims are drawn to class 709. Applicants assert that by searching and using references from classes 705 and 709 in response to claims supposedly drawn to class 715, the Examiner is prohibited from basing a distinctiveness argument on a classification of newly added claims to class 709.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), claims 1-24 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1-24 are considered moot in view of the cancellations, and therefore, it is respectfully requested that the §112, second paragraph, §102(b) rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding new claims 25-46, Applicants respectfully assert that Yonezawa fails to disclose the limitations of such claims.

For example, independent claim 25 recites a method for providing a printing service for electronic data over a computer network. A print request is received from a client computer at a printing provider computer. A data file associated with the print request is obtained from a data provider computer at the printing provider computer. The printing provider computer requests the printing of the data file and the dispatching of the printed data file to a client. Independent claims 41, 42 and 45 recite similar limitations.

Further, independent claim 36, recites a method for providing a printing service for electronic data over a computer network. A search process is initialized at a data provider computer in response to a request from a client computer for a data file. Search results of the search process are transmitted from the data provider computer to the client computer. A data file transmission request

is received at the data provider computer from a printing provider computer. The printing provider computer was associated with the search results and contacted by the client computer. A data file is transmitted from the data provider computer to the printing provider computer in response to the data file transmission request for printing of the data file at a printing provider and delivery of the printed data file to a client. Independent claims 43, 44 and 46 recite similar limitations.

Yonezawa fails to disclose techniques for providing a printing service for electronic data over a computer network. Yonezawa also fails to disclose each of the limitations recited in the independent claims above. Further, relating to prior art made of record as cited by the Examiner, Applicants assert that U.S. Patent No. 6,659,662 to Grohs is not prior art.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 25, 36 and 41-46 are patentable over the cited reference. In addition, Applicants submit that claims 26-35 and 37-40 are patentable over the cited reference not only due to their respective dependence on claims 25 and 36 but also because such claims recite patentable subject matter in their own right.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 25-46 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: April 14, 2005

Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,856
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547